

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

### Claim Rejections 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1-29 are rejected, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as allegedly being unpatentable over Reitmeier (U.S. Patent No. 6,115,080) (hereinafter Reitmeier) in view of Fries et al., (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0078807) (hereinafter Fries). Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection in view of the following.

Independent Claim 1 recites a method for displaying digital content using a second tuner during spare periods to access a second transport stream associated with a second frequency, as claimed.

In contrast, Reitmeier discloses using a second tuner that, in response to a control signal, down converts a desired television signal to produce a second intermediate frequency television signal (see Reitmeier, col. 3, lines 56-59). However, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest when the second tuner down converts the desired signal. As such, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest the limitations of using a second tuner during spare periods to access a second transport stream associated with a second frequency, as claimed.

Independent Claim 1 further recites decoding digital content and caching the digital content into a memory buffer and upon the first tuner being switched to

a new channel associated with the program information stored in the memory buffer, recalling the digital content, as claimed. Accordingly, the same memory component is used in caching and recalling the digital content.

In contrast, Reitmeier discloses using a frame buffer to store a single video frame (see Reitmeier, col. 5, lines 9-10). Reitmeier further discloses using a memory component to retrieve the I-frame associated with the desired new channel (see Reitmeier, col. 9 line 64 to col. 10 line 3). The frame buffer used to store a single video frame is different from the memory component used to retrieve the I-frame (see Reitmeier, Figure 1, elements 34 and 55). As such, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest decoding digital content and caching the digital content into a memory buffer and upon the first tuner being switched to a new channel associated with the program information stored in the memory buffer, recalling the digital content in the claimed fashion because the frame buffer and the memory component of Reitmeier are different.

The rejection admits that Reitmeier fails to teach that the first transport stream is associated with a first frequency and the second transport stream is associated with a second frequency. The rejection relies on Fries. Applicants respectfully submit that Fries fails to remedy the shortcomings of Reitmeier, as presented above. Particularly, Fries fails to teach or suggest using a second tuner during spare periods to access a second transport stream associated with

a second frequency, as claimed. Furthermore, Fries fails to teach or suggest decoding digital content and caching the digital content into a memory buffer and upon the first tuner being switched to a new channel associated with the program information stored in the memory buffer, recalling the digital content in the claimed fashion.

Accordingly, Reitmeier alone or in combination with Fries fails to render independent Claim 1 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claims 9 recites limitations similar to that of independent Claim 1 and is patentable for similar reasons. For example, independent Claim 9 is patentable because Reitmeier discloses that in the case of multiple tuner/demodulator system, an additional tuner/demodulator pair is used to scan other physical channels (see Reitmeier, col. 15, lines 31-34). Reitmeier discloses two tuners and two demodulators (see Reitmeier, Figure 1, elements 10A, 10B, 15A and 15B). As such, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest a third tuner to access a third transport stream associated with a third frequency, as claimed.

Referring still to Claim 9, Fries discloses a first tuner and an optional second tuner (see Fries, paragraph 77 and see Figure 3, element 300 and 302). Fries further discloses that these two tuners are representative of one or more in-

band tuners that tune to various frequencies (see Fries, paragraph 77). As such, Fries fails to teach or suggest a third tuner to access a third transport stream associated with a third frequency, as claimed.

Accordingly, Reitmeier alone or in combination with Fries fails to render independent Claim 9 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 17 recites limitations similar to that of independent Claim 1 and is patentable for similar reasons. For example, Claim 17 recites caching the table information into a memory buffer and recalling the table information for use in providing a fast channel change operation in the new channel, as claimed. Thus, the same memory buffer is used to recall the table information, as claimed. On the other hand, Reitmeier discloses a frame buffer and a different memory component, as presented and discussed above. As such, Reitmeier alone or in combination with Fries fails to render independent Claim 17 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

Independent Claim 23 recites that upon a channel change to a new channel associated with the second program, using the second decoder to display in the main picture area of the display screen, as claimed.

In contrast, Reitmeier discloses a video decoder for producing a decoded video stream, e.g., decompressed (see Reitmeier, col. 4, lines 54-55). Reitmeier further discloses an optional auxiliary decoder (see Reitmeier, col. 4, lines 59-60) that is used during a picture in picture mode of operation (see Reitmeier, col. 5, lines 23-27). As such, Reitmeier fails to teach or suggest that upon a channel change to a new channel associated with the second program, using the second decoder to display in the main picture area of the display screen, as claimed.

Accordingly, Reitmeier alone or in combination with Fries fails to render independent Claim 23 obvious, under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). Dependent claims are patentable by virtue of their dependency.

As such, allowance of Claims 1-29 is earnestly solicited.

For the above reasons, the Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103.

### CONCLUSION

In light of the above listed remarks, reconsideration of the rejected claims is requested. Based on the arguments presented above, it is respectfully submitted that Claims 1-29 overcome the rejections of record and, therefore, allowance of the rejected Claims 1-29 is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees or apply any credits to our PTO deposit account number: 50-4160.

Respectfully submitted,  
MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP

Dated: 10-02-2008

/Amir A. Tabarrok/  
Amir A. Tabarrok  
Registration No. 57,137

MURABITO, HAO & BARNES LLP  
Two North Market Street  
Third Floor  
San Jose, California 95113

(408) 938-9060 Voice  
(408) 938-9069 Facsimile